

### REMARKS

These remarks and the accompanying amendments are responsive to the Office Action dated November 20, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as the "Office Action"). By this amendment, all but Claims 10, 58 and 59 are cancelled. Of these remaining claims, only Claim 10 is in independent form. Claims 10, 58 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States patent number 5,603,082 issued to Hamabe (hereinafter "Hamabe") in view of non-patent literature authored by Watanabe et al. (hereinafter "Watanabe"). The remaining rejections are rendered moot in light of the cancellation of the claims herein.

The mobile communications system as recited in Claim 10 assigns "channel identifiers belonging to a same group to the sectors in a same base station." When the mobile station searches a neighboring cell, the mobile station first searches other channel identifiers in a same group as the received channel identifier belongs to. This search is performed in priority to search channel identifiers in the other groups. The spreading code is allocated to each base station with predetermined rules, and as a result, time and power of the search for a neighboring cell is reduced in spite of the asynchronous system.

Watanabe discloses a base station code assignment for a CDMA/TDD system (a synchronous system). That is, it is essential that the base stations in the group be in synchronization with each other. In contrast, the present invention can dispense with synchronization between the base stations. The mobile communications system of the present invention differs from the synchronous system of Watanabe. Watanabe and Hamabe nowhere discloses specific constructions of the mobile station and the mobile communications system for

applying to an asynchronous system. Thus, the present invention is inventive over the disclosures of Hamabe and Watanabe, either singly or in combination.<sup>1</sup>

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 20th day of April, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/ADRIAN J. LEE/

Adrian J. Lee  
Registration No. 42,785  
Attorney for Applicants  
Customer No. 022913

AJL:ds  
DS0000007355V001

---

<sup>1</sup> Since even the combination would not teach or suggest all of the features of the claim, it is not necessary at this time for a full and complete response to address arguments against the combination itself. Accordingly, the lack of arguments against combining these reference should not be viewed as the Applicant acquiescing that combination is appropriate.